

BMCW Progress Report

Part 3 OF 3

Process Indicators and Outcomes

January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006

For Informational Purposes Only



Division of Children and Family Services
Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW)

August 21, 2006

Please note this information is embargoed (not for public release or publication) until 1:00 pm on August 21, 2006

Prepared by the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare Program Evaluation Managers

PART 3 – PROCESS INDICATORS AND OUTCOMES

Contents

Introduction	4
Process Indicators and Outcomes	5
Timeliness of completing initial family assessments.....	5
Timeliness of initial health screens for children entering out-of-home care.....	6
Placement packet information regarding child’s health and educational background.....	8
Children with an updated annual physical & dental examination.....	9
Timeliness of completing the initial permanency plan	11
Timeliness of judicial or administrative permanency plan reviews.....	12
Children re-entering out-of-home care within 12 months of leaving a prior out-of-home care episode.....	13
Ongoing case manager turnover	16

This is Part 3 of the three part BMCW Semi-annual Report

Part 1: Remaining Enforceable Provisions

Part 2: Provisions BMCW Released From

Part 3: Process Indicators and Outcomes

Process Indicators and Outcomes at a Glance
January – June 2006

Process Indicators and Outcomes	Period 1 Result (CY 2003)	Period 2 Result (CY 2004)	Period 3 Result (CY 2005)	January to June 2006 Result
Family assessments completed within 90 days	96%	97%	95%	97%
Initial health screens – within 5 business days	58%	76%	67%	80%
Placement packets to Foster Parents	91%	85%	97%	67%
Annual medical exam	75%	74%	73%	86%
Annual dental exam	57%	64%	64%	79%
Initial Permanency Plans within 60 days	97%	97%	98%	95%
Annual Permanency Plan Reviews	77%	77%	92%	91%
Re-Entry within 12 months of exit	9%	7%	7%	13.9%
BMCW Turnover	30%	39%	20%	12.7%

Introduction

As of December 31, 2005, the BMCW reached the conclusion of the third year of the Settlement Agreement between Children's Rights, Inc., on behalf of the plaintiffs, and the Department of Health and Family Services, and other State defendants.

Consistent with Section III.C of the Agreement, the requirement to conduct reviews and produce reports under this section terminates on December 31, 2005. The BMCW will continue to report to and inform the community on the progress toward achieving the identified process indicators and outcomes.

Report Format

The performance data represent the results of the efforts of the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare during January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006.

The data in this report is for process indicators and outcomes inclusive of safety, well-being and permanence objectives, formerly known as the "monitoring items".

Most of the data presented in this report has been generated from the electronic Wisconsin Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (eWiSACWIS). To consistently and systematically assess the Agreement outcomes, a process was undertaken to identify which data elements could be generated using the eWiSACWIS system. If changes were required, enhancements to eWiSACWIS were identified. This included the development of a measurement package and software designed to measure many of the Agreement elements. Work continues on managing artifact data and other data validation issues within the eWiSACWIS system. The quality of the data is dependent on complete and accurate data entry by staff, system conversions and system builds/updates. When identified, improvements to the data system are made as soon as possible to improve the accuracy and consistency of reporting.

Process Indicators and Outcomes

Well-Being

Timeliness of completing initial family assessments

BMCW provision of an initial family assessment for all children within 90 days of their first placement.

Timeliness of Initial Assessments

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD
Family Assessment Data							
Region 1 (CFCP) Family Assessments due (N)	23	20	7	12	20	12	94
Family Assessments completed within 90 days	20	20	7	12	19	12	90
Percentage (point in time)	87%	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	96%
Region 2 (CFCP) Family Assessments due (N)	15	13	15	23	35	10	111
Family Assessments completed within 90 days	12	13	15	21	35	10	106
Percentage (point in time)	80%	100%	100%	91%	100%	100%	95%
Region 3 (La Causa) Family Assessments due (N)	10	10	14	12	11	23	80
Family Assessments completed within 90 days	10	10	14	12	11	23	80
Percentage (point in time)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
BMCW – New families entering for OCM services (N)	48	43	36	47	66	45	285
Family Assessments completed within 90 days	42	43	36	45	65	45	276
BMCW Percentage (point in time)	88%	100%	100%	96%	98%	100%	97%

Semi-Annual and Annual Performance

	January – June	July - December	YTD
BMCW Period 1 2003	95%	98%	96%
BMCW Period 2 2004	98%	97%	97%
BMCW Period 3 2005	95%	95%	95%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	97%		

Throughout the first six months of CY 2006, 97% (276) family assessments were completed within 90 days.

Well-Being

Timeliness of initial health screens for children entering out-of-home care

BMCW provision of an initial medical examination for all children within five business days of their first placement, except for children discharged from hospital to placement.

Timeliness of Initial Medical Exams

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD
Region 1 (CFCP) (N)	46	24	45	31	17	20	183
Within 5 business days	34	22	35	22	9	15	137
Percentage	74%	92%	78%	71%	53%	75%	75%
Region 2 (CFCP) (N)	15	24	36	21	27	16	139
Within 5 business days	10	20	26	16	25	14	111
Percentage	67%	83%	72%	76%	93%	88%	80%
Region 3 (La Causa) (N)	25	25	33	25	20	33	161
Within 5 business days	18	20	30	25	12	31	136
Percentage	72%	80%	91%	100%	60%	94%	84%
BMCW (N)	86	73	114	77	64	69	483
BMCW Completed within 5 business days	62	62	91	63	46	60	384
BMCW % (PIT)	72%	85%	80%	82%	72%	87%	80%

Semi-Annual and Annual Performance

	January - June	July - December	Annual Performance
BMCW Period 1 2003	44%	68%	58%
BMCW Period 2 2004	82%	71%	76%
BMCW Period 3 2005	59%	77%	67%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	80%		

In the performance average for the first six-months of CY 2006, the BMCW showed a 21% increase over the same time period in CY 2005.

In addition to tracking children receiving an initial medical examination within five business days of their first placement, the bureau tracks all children in their first placement to verify all children have an exam or the reasons why such exams are not completed. The charts below detail this tracking:

Discussion

Children who did not receive a health check within five business days

	Number Completed	Cumulative Total Completed	Cumulative Percentage
Region 1	(N = 183)		
Up to 7 Days	12	149	81.4%
Up to 10 Days	14	163	89.1%
Up to 14 Days	2	165	90.2%
15+ days	2	167	91.3%
Region 2	(N = 139)		
Up to 7 Days	14	125	89.9%
Up to 10 Days	3	128	92.1%
Up to 14 Days	2	130	93.5%
15+ days	0	130	93.5%
Region 3	(N = 161)		
Up to 7 Days	15	151	93.8%
Up to 10 Days	3	154	95.7%
Up to 14 Days	1	155	96.3%
15+ days	1	156	96.9%
Unknown	11	483	2.3%
Region 1	9		
Region 2	1		
Region 3	1		
Reason provided for no appointment	19	483	3.9%
Region 1	5		
Region 2	8		
Region 3	6		
Children who were exceptions and did not require an Initial Health Check			
Exclusion category	(N)	Number of children who received health check but are not included in the total (N)	
Newborns	31		
Returned home or with relative before fifth business day	94	33	
ICPC/Intra-State/Corrections	2		
AWOL or refused to participate	14	4	
Not Initial placement (and other)	3		

- 31 children (newborns) were placed from the hospital to out-of-home-care placements that are not included in the total number of children
- The data in the first table show that 94% of the children who require an initial health check have it completed within the first two weeks of entering an out-of-home-care placement.
- For 2% of the children, information was not available to determine if the child received an initial health check.

- For 4% of the children, it was contrary to the child's medical condition to transport the child for a health check.
- Of the 94 children who returned home prior to the fifth business day, 33 (35%) of the children had an initial health check before returning home. These 33 children are not included in the performance standard totals.

Placement packet information regarding child's health and educational background

BMCW provision of a complete placement information packet regarding a child's health and educational background for a random sample of at least 50 children being placed with a new caretaker.

Placement packets provided to sample group

	(N)	Completed	CY 2006 YTD Result
Region 1 (CFCP) (N)	17	11	65%
Region 2 (CFCP) (N)	17	8	47%
Region 3 (La Causa) (N)	17	15	88%
BMCW %	51	34	67%

A random sample was drawn of 17 cases per region where a child's placement began on or after January 1, 2006. Each region provided verification that the caregiver received and signed for a copy of the placement checklist (CFS-2238).

During the review of the documentation, two training issues arose regarding use of the placement information packet:

1. Workers indicated that they left the signed copy in the provider placement packet. The signed document is required to be in the child's family file.
2. Some workers thought this document only needed to be completed for the initial placement, not subsequent placements.

All three regions are aware of these training issues.

Children with an updated annual physical & dental examination

BMCW referral of children in BMCW custody to health care services and utilization of health care services, including regular pediatric medical and dental examinations.

Annual Medical and Dental Exams

January 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Dental exam Compliance %
Region 1	860	930	92.5%	92.5%		700	817	85.7%	85.7%
Region 2	720	823	87.5%	87.5%		549	696	78.9%	78.9%
Region 3	573	730	78.5%	78.5%		444	619	71.7%	71.7%
Administrative	52	91	57.1%	57.1%		35	74	47.3%	47.3%
BMCW	2205	2574	85.7%	85.7%		1728	2206	78.3%	78.3%

February 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Dental exam compliance %
Region 1	845	943	89.6%	91.0%		686	820	83.7%	84.7%
Region 2	707	824	85.8%	86.6%		525	696	75.4%	77.2%
Region 3	549	721	76.1%	77.3%		405	608	66.6%	69.2%
Administrative	37	60	61.7%	58.9%		28	54	51.9%	49.2%
BMCW	2138	2548	83.9%	84.8%		1644	2178	75.5%	76.9%

March 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Dental exam compliance %
Region 1	815	902	90.4%	90.8%		645	773	83.4%	84.3%
Region 2	805	890	90.4%	88.0%		608	758	80.2%	78.2%
Region 3	625	739	84.6%	79.8%		474	608	78.0%	72.1%
Administrative	4	13	30.8%	56.7%		2	9	22.2%	47.4%
BMCW	2249	2544	88.4%	86.0%		1729	2148	80.5%	78.1%

April 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTe Dental Exam compliance %
Region 1	780	883	88.3%	90.2%		625	762	82.0%	83.7%
Region 2	799	912	87.6%	87.9%		621	763	81.4%	79.1%
Region 3	632	734	86.1%	81.4%		473	598	79.1%	73.8%
Administrative	15	18	83.3%	59.3%		13	17	76.5%	50.6%
BMCW	2226	2547	87.4%	86.3%		1732	2140	80.9%	78.8%

May 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly Percentage (point in time)	YTD Dental exam compliance %
Region 1	744	864	86.1%	89.4%		593	739	80.2%	83.1%
Region 2	784	892	87.9%	87.9%		611	744	82.1%	79.7%
Region 3	639	721	88.6%	82.8%		468	587	79.7%	75.0%
Administrative	19	25	76.0%	61.4%		13	16	81.3%	53.5%
BMCW	2186	2502	87.4%	86.5%		1685	2086	80.8%	79.2%

June 2006'

	Medical exams documented (current)	Number of children in rating period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Medical exam compliance %		Dental exams documented (current)	Children in OHC 3+ yrs old during period (N)	Monthly percentage (point in time)	YTD Dental exam compliance %
Region 1	737	850	86.7%	89.0%		586	726	80.7%	82.7%
Region 2	762	903	84.4%	87.3%		600	763	78.6%	79.5%
Region 3	617	704	87.6%	83.6%		455	569	80.0%	75.8%
Administrative	12	23	52.2%	60.4%		9	21	42.9%	52.4%
BMCW	2128	2480	85.8%	86.4%		1650	2079	79.4%	79.2%

* Children identified within the administrative region are children who may be in process of changing assignment types but are included in the data set.

Medical

	June YTD Average (Semi-Annual)	December Average (Annual)
BMCW Period 1 2003	65%	75%
BMCW Period 2 2004	73%	74%
BMCW Period 3 2005	69%	73%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	86%	

Dental

	June YTD Average (Semi-Annual)	December Average (Annual)
BMCW Period 1 2003	25%	57%
BMCW Period 2 2004	62%	65%
BMCW Period 3 2005	63%	64%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	79%	

The tables above present the monthly percentages by region for children who are up-to-date on their annual physical and dental exams, as indicated in WiSACWIS.

Throughout the first six months of CY 2006, there has been noticeable improvement showing that there is a higher percentage of children on a regular basis who have had their annual physical and dentals exams. At year end 2005, on average, 73% of the children in care during the year were current with their annual physical exam and 64% were current with their annual dental exam.

During the first six months of CY 2006, 86% of the children have been current with their annual medical exam, and 79% have been current with their annual dental exam; There was a 13% increase during the first six months of this year for children with an up-to-date medical exam. The percentage increase for annual dental exams was even higher for the same period at 14%.

Permanency

Timeliness of completing the initial permanency plan

BMCW compliance with the federal standard for an initial case plan/permanency plan to be in place for all children within 60 days of a child entering BMCW custody.

Timeliness of completing initial permanency plan

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD
Semi-Annual Initial Permanency Plans							
Region 1 (CFCP - Number of Perm Plans due during period) (N)	14	20	13	31	31	15	124
Number of initial Perm Plans completed on time	13	20	12	26	27	15	113
Percentage (point in time)	93%	100%	92%	84%	87%	100%	91%
Region 2 (CFCP - Number of Perm Plans due during period) (N)	27	31	25	30	59	18	190
Number of initial Perm Plans completed on time	22	31	25	27	59	18	182
Percentage (point in time)	81%	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%	96%
Region 3 (La Causa - Number of Perm Plans due during period) (N)	6	13	34	24	24	28	129
Number of initial Perm Plans completed on time	6	13	32	22	23	28	124
Percentage (point in time)	100%	100%	94%	92%	96%	100%	96%
BMCW (point in time)	87%	100%	96%	88%	96%	100%	95%

Semi-Annual and Annual Performance

	January - June	July - December	YTD
BMCW Period 1 2003	95%	99%	97%
BMCW Period 2 2004	97%	97%	97%
BMCW Period 3 2005	99%	98%	98%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	95%		

Throughout the first six months of CY 2006, 95% of all initial Permanency Plans were completed within 60 days of a child entering out-of-home-care.

Timeliness of judicial or administrative permanency plan reviews

State compliance with the federal requirement for a judicial or administrative permanency plan review every 6 months and at least one judicial permanency plan review annually.

Timeliness of judicial or administrative permanency plan reviews

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Total - YTD Average
BMCW							
(N)	507	376	447	439	464	417	2,650
Current PPRs & APPR's	468	350	402	393	427	380	2,420
Percentage Compliant	92.3%	93.1%	89.9%	89.5%	92.0%	91.1%	91.3%

*APPR – Permanency Plan heard in court

PPR – Permanency Plan heard by Court Commissioner

	January to June Average	July to December Average	YTD Average
BMCW Period 1 2003	77%	89%	64%
BMCW Period 2 2004	75%	82%	77%
BMCW Period 3 2005	91%	93%	92%
BMCW CY 2006 (YTD)	91%		

During the first six months of CY 2006, 91% of the scheduled Permanency Plans were conducted timely.

Children re-entering out-of-home care within 12 months of leaving a prior out-of-home care episode

The percentage of children re-entering BMCW out-of-home care within the period who have re-entered care within 12 months of a prior BMCW out-of-home care episode.

Of the 509 children who were placed in out-of-home care between January and June 2006, 109 children re-entered care after a prior episode. Of the 109 children who re-entered care, 71 (65%) did so within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

Re-entry into out-of-home care after reunification

Month (2006)	Number of children who entered out-of-home-care - January to June (2006)	Number of children who re-entered OHC within 12 months of a prior OHC episode – January to June (2006)
January	71	20
February	83	8
March	126	20
April	77	14
May	77	6
June	75	3
Totals (YTD)	509	71

Between January and June 2006, 71 children re-entered out-of-home care in 12 or fewer months of a previous out-of-home care (ongoing services) episode. This compares to 40 children who re-entered during the first six-months of CY 2005; 52 children who re-entered during the first six-months of CY 2004, and the 32 who re-entered during the first six-months of CY 2003.

Semi-Annual and Annual Performance

	January - June	July - December	Year Ending
Period 1 (2003)			7.1%
Period 2 (2004)	7.9%	5.3%	6.6%
Period 3 (2005)	5.9%	8.4%	7.0%
CY 2006 (YTD)	13.9%		

Discussion

The following table shows groupings of identified reasons children returned to an out-of-home care placement during CY 2006. A return to out-of-home care often involves multiple issues involving the caretakers and complicated dynamics within the family. The data below may not provide the specific reason for the return, but it does capture the general issues within the family structure that led to the child's return to out-of-home care. Although these groupings provide an opportunity to understand some of the reasons children returned to out-of-home care, each family situation is unique.

Reason for return to out-of-home care placement (reported by case managers)			
	2004 (N)	2005 (N)	Jan- June 2006
Parents' unstable living environment, parent relapsed, domestic violence, untreated mental health	48	39	28
Emotional and behavior needs of child exceeded that of parent/caretaker ability to care for the child	14	12	11
Parent unwilling to care for child, abandonment	NA	8	5
Parent incarcerated	6	5	12
Neglect	6	5	0
Physical abuse	9	3	6
Medical neglect	0	1	0
Death of primary caretaker	0	1	0
Sexual abuse	0	1	0
Teen mother unable to adequately provide for child – neglect	3	0	2
Subtotal (available information):	86	75	64
Information not available at time of report	0	8	7
Total	86	83	71

For the first six months of CY 2006, the most frequent reason provided for children who re-entered out-of-home care was related to the *parent's unstable living environment, parent relapsed, domestic violence, untreated mental health*. For 18 (reported) of the children who re-entered, their parents relapsed with substance abuse problems, and six who re-entered were involved in domestic violence situations within the home.

Two areas with apparent increases YTD were those where the child re-entered because the parent was incarcerated (12 children) and where the parents were unable to care for the child because of the child's extensive emotional and or behavior needs (11 children). The number of children returned because their parent(s) were incarcerated is already twice as high at the six-month point of CY 2006, as all of CY 2004 and CY 2005.

There were 44 children who were part of a sibling group that re-entered out-of-home care in 12 or fewer months of a prior BMCW out-of-home care episode during the first six-months of CY 2006.

Sibling Groups re-entering

	2 children in Sibling Group	3 children in Sibling Group	4 children in Sibling Group	5 children in Sibling Group	6 children in Sibling Group
Jan – June 2006	8	3	2	1	1
CY 2005	10	1	0	0	1
CY 2004	8	5	0	1	1

- During CY 2006 YTD, there is a notable increase in children who are members of sibling groups who re-entered OHC. The 44 children, of 15 sibling groups, account for 62% of all children who re-entered out-of-home care in 12 or fewer months.
- During Period 3 there were 29 children (12 sib groups) who re-entered.
- During Period 2, there were 15 sibling groups who re-entered out-of-home care in 12 or fewer months of a prior BMCW out-of-home care episode, accounting for 49% of the re-entries.

Children on a Court order or in an Open Family case at time of re-entry

	Children Re-Entered	Sib Groups	Child on a Court Order of Supervision	Case Open at time of Re-entry
Jan – June 2006	71	15	48	55
Total CY 2005	83	12	51	60
Total CY 2004	86	15	69	71

- 48 of the 71 (68%) children who re-entered out-of-home care were on a court order of supervision at the time of re-entering out-of-home care. This is a 7% increase from Period 3. An ongoing case manager continued to monitor and supervise the children after they were reunified.

Because this is only the first six-months of the year, we cannot accurately compare to the final year-end data for CY 2005 or CY 2006, where there were 69 of 86 (80%) children on a court order of supervision at the time of re-entry.

- 55 of the children who re-entered out-of-home care were in an open family case at the time of their re-entry. In these cases, an ongoing case manager was supervising the family.
- The average age of a child re-entering was 9.3 years old for the first six months of CY 2006. This compares to 11.2 yrs old in CY 2005 and 7.7 yrs old in CY 2004.
- There are multiple variables involved when a child re-enters out-of-home-care. With the increased number of children who re-entered during the first six months of CY 2006, this issue will continue to be monitored to assess factors that lead to re-entry as well as what can be done to further maintain successful reunifications.

Ongoing case manager turnover

Ongoing case manager turnover rates per BMCW case management site, identifying the number of ongoing case managers carrying cases at the beginning of the reporting period, the number of ongoing case managers carrying cases who leave for any reason during the reporting period, and the number of ongoing case managers carrying cases added during the period.

Monthly turnover is calculated by identifying the number of case carrying workers who terminated employment for any reason (including internal promotions, retiring, relocating and going back to school) during the month divided by the number of case carrying workers at the beginning of the month, plus the case carrying workers added during the month. Using this methodology to determine a BMCW turnover rate for the first six months of CY 2006, the calculation would reflect a 12.7% turnover rate (30 workers exited /217 workers as of Jan 1st + 19 hires = 12.7%).

The BMCW and its private partner agencies continue to recognize the importance and value of a diverse, competent, trained, and supported child welfare workforce. Recognizing the integral role that the BMCW staff perform in the delivery of services to children and families, workforce development continues to have a prominent position in quality improvement efforts. The BMCW management understands, however, that some turnover is inevitable due to changes in the life circumstances of staff. The BMCW and its private partner agencies remain committed to addressing and reducing preventable turnover, defining career ladders for staff, providing additional support through increased mentoring and on-the-job training, and other recruitment and retention initiatives.

Reviews completed by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) by researchers Flower, McDonald and Sumski in January 2005 took a comprehensive look at turnover among case managers in the BMCW to help improve the recruitment and retention of child welfare staff.

During CY 2006, the BMCW continues to develop ways to not only maintain a stable workforce, but also enhance the professional development and maturity of the workforce. This included the development of the Workforce Steering Committee and its many subcommittees comprised of staff from across all program areas. Staff input into this crucial issue has provided the BMCW with a list of recommendations that it has begun implementing. These include such things as providing laptop computers so staff may document cases as they make their home visits, to creating a BMCW-wide newsletter, to developing cross program teams to share expertise and information. Please refer to the attached seven documents that provide monthly summaries of the significant efforts by the members of the workgroup.

Other initiatives include:

- The continued BMCW partnership with University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Social Welfare established a part-time Master of Social Work (MSW) Program. This program is for state and private agency staff who want to earn their MSW degree while continuing to work full-time. Classes are usually held each semester and are offered at BMCW office locations in the evening or on weekends. It takes four years to complete the curriculum in the part-time program. In the last three semesters, participants drop to half-time employment while completing the required field internships.

Staff who are admitted receive full tuition (subject to the continuing availability of federal

Title IV-E funds) plus an allowance for books. In return, they must sign a contract agreeing to maintain one semester of full-time equivalent employment for each semester they complete a class.

- There is also a two-year full-time MSW program option for BMCW staff. Participants receive a stipend and a book allowance and must sign a contract to return to BMCW for at least two years after receiving their MSW degree.
- Ongoing and regular collaboration with the Milwaukee Child Welfare Partnership Council to develop and incorporate additional strategies identified to enhance the BMCW workforce.

The following set of tables illustrates the flow of ongoing case managers hired at each region, as well as those who terminated their employment. Data for the first six months of CY 2006 has been updated with corroborating information provided by each region.

Ongoing Case Manager Employment by Region

Region 1 (CFCP) 2006 YTD	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD 2006
Ongoing Case Managers at Start of Month	74	68	66	64	66	68	
Ongoing Case Managers Hired During Month	0	0	1	3	2	1	7
Ongoing Case Managers Terminated During Month	6	2	3	1	0	0	12
Turnover %	8.1%	2.9%	4.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%

Region 2 (CFCP) 2006 YTD	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD 2006
Ongoing Case Managers at Start of Month	81	80	78	77	78	79	
Ongoing Case Managers Hired During Month	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
Ongoing Case Managers Terminated During Month	1	2	1	1	2	3	10
Turnover %	1.2%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	3.8%	11.6%

Region 3 (La Causa) 2006 YTD	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	YTD 2006
Ongoing Case Managers at Start of Month	62	61	61	58	60	61	
Ongoing Case Managers Hired During Month	1	0	0	2	3	1	7
Ongoing Case Managers Terminated During Month	2	0	3	0	2	1	8
Turnover %	3.2%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	3.3%	1.6%	11.6%

BMCW		Number of OCM's terminated for any reason during period	Number of OCM's at beginning of period (and AVG)	Number of OCM's hired during period	Turnover Rate for Period - Per Definition used in Settlement
	January 06'	9	217	1	4.1%
	February 06'	4	207	0	1.9%
	March 06'	7	203	1	3.4%
	April 06'	2	198	7	1.0%
	May 06'	4	199	8	1.9%
	June 06'	4	202	2	2.0%
YTD Total		30	204.3	19	12.7%
	2005 Jan - June	57	212.6	73	
	2004 Jan - June	63	223.6	45	
	2003 Jan - June	57	220.5	68	

Discussion

The following is a brief summary of information relating to the workforce:

- In CY 2005, 27 (23.8%) ongoing case managers with three or more years of experience ended their employment or were transferred or promoted.
- In CY 2006 YTD, four ongoing case managers (13.3%) with three or more years of experience ended their employment or were transferred or promoted.

The range of experience for the four workers spanned 3.2 years up to 6 years, with an average of 4.5 yrs. The reasons they left the workforce include:

- Terminated (1)
 - Left for parenting/child rearing responsibilities (1)
 - Accepted a job in social services not related to child welfare (1)
 - Leave of absence (1)
- During the first six-months of CY 2006, 43% (13) of the ongoing case managers who terminated their employment did so within 12 months of being hired. In CY 2005, 37.1% of the ongoing case managers who ended their employment did so within 12 months of being hired. This compares to 33.8% of all ongoing case managers who left during Period 2, and 33.6% from Period 1.

The table below shows by employment category the length of employment for ongoing case managers as of June 30, 2006:

Length of Employment

	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Terminated Employees	0.07	6.0	1.6
Active Employees	0.01	8.5	2.1
Active Employees - Start of the Year	0.01	8.0	1.8

In the previous report, there was a discussion about the importance of a stepped progression in the length of employment data as the year moves forward. It was suggested that an agency would like most of the employees to progressively have longer length of employment with fewer employees in the front-end group with lower length of employment, or growth in the maturity of each agency's workforce. The table below shows the breakout by length of employment (with current agency. If an employee moved to a new agency during the regional transition in January 2006, the employee maintained their original date of hire at the new agency). This information is for all ongoing case managers active as of June 30, 2006.

Number and Percentage of active ongoing case managers at end of review periods						
Time LOE	2004'	% of total	2005'	% of total	2006 YTD	% of total
0 - 6 Months	50	22.8%	54	24.0%	18	8.5%
7 to 12 months	33	15.1%	60	26.7%	45	21.3%
13 - 18 months	21	9.6%	28	12.4%	51	24.2%
19 to 24 months	28	12.8%	17	7.6%	24	11.4%
25 to 36 months	40	18.3%	21	9.3%	21	10.0%
37 + Months	47	21.5%	45	20.0%	52	24.6%

As the data demonstrate in the tables above and below, the workforce has started to show progress towards maturing. The number of ongoing case managers with six or fewer months experience at their current agency has dropped significantly. In fact, there was a 20.8% decrease between the percentage of the workforce with 12 or fewer months experience when comparing CY 2005 and CY 2006 YTD. Ongoing case managers who stayed with the agency and moved between the 7 to 12 months and 13 to 18 months showed the largest growth in 2.5 years. In CY 2004, there were 21 ongoing case managers in this category, which increased to 28 ongoing case managers at the end of CY 2005. By June 2006, this number increased to 51 ongoing case managers.

There was growth in the number and percentage (compared to Dec 31, 2005) in all Length of Employment categories from 13 months forward.

Length of Employment 2004–YTD 2006

	% of OCM's with one year or less LOE	% of OCM's with two years or less LOE	% of OCM's with more than two years LOE
CY 2006 YTD	29.9%	65.4%	34.6%
CY 2005	50.7%	70.7%	29.3%
CY 2004	37.9%	60.3%	39.7%

The table below illustrates a 3.5 year comparison of the different reasons ongoing case managers provided when they separated their employment from the agency (or were promoted) for Period 1, Period 2, Period 3, and the first six months of CY 2006.

Reasons for employment separation comparison by years								
Identified reason for employment separation	Period 1 (N)	Period 1 % of Exits	Period 2 (N)	Period 2 % of Exits	Period 3 (N)	Period 3 % of Exits	Jan – June 2006 (N)	Jan – June 2006 % of Exits
Voluntary resignation reason not provided	41	40.1%	36	28.6%	3	2.7%	8	26.7%
Terminated by agency	14	13.8%	9	7.1%	5	4.4%	5	16.7%
Unknown	11	10.8%	9	7.2%	11	9.7%		
Job Dissatisfaction – General	6	5.8%	7	5.6%	5	4.4%	2	6.7%
Job Dissatisfaction - Pay related	0	0	0	0	1	0.9%		
Job Dissatisfaction - Not what expected	0	0	0	0	2	1.8%		
Another Position in Soc Serv - Not Child Welfare	6	5.8%	3	2.4%	22	19.5%	4	13.3%
Moved out of the area	5	4.9%	23	18.3%	14	12.4%	5	16.7%
IVE – Program	5	4.9%	2	1.6%	1	0.9%		
Another position outside of social services	4	3.9%	10	7.9%	5	4.4%		
Transferred to another Site with BMCW	3	2.9%	2	1.6%	0	0		
To attend school	2	1.9%	10	7.9%	14	12.4%	2	6.7%
Internal Transfer - same agency Different Program	2	1.9%	9	7.1%	3	2.7%	1	3.3%
Internal Promotion - same program	2	1.9%	1	0.8%	12	10.6%		
Accepted a job with the State of Wisconsin	1	0.9%	5	4.0%	1	0.9%		
Other - Personal Reasons, Domestic Responsibilities, Health (added in 05')	0	0	0	0	14	12.4%	3	10%

More specific to the first six months of CY 2006 with the category identifying why the ongoing case manager exited employment, the number by category, the minimum length of time employed, the maximum length of time employed, and the average length of time employed

Reason for separation from employment (CY 2006 YTD)

	(N)	Min (yrs)	Max (yrs)	Avg (yrs)
Voluntary Resignation reason not provided (unknown)	8	0.13	2.62	1.24
Terminated by Agency	5	0.07	6.00	1.73
Spousal Job Relocation - moved out of area (other)	5	0.74	2.74	1.62
Another Position in Soc Serv - Not Child Welfare	4	0.57	3.20	2.00
Job Dissatisfaction - General	2	0.10	0.87	0.49
Parenting/Child Rearing	2	0.61	4.75	2.68
Full-time graduate education	2	1.11	1.18	1.15
Transferred within Agency	1	1.61	1.61	1.61
Leave of Absence	1	4.02	4.02	4.02

The information and figures in the following section are only provided for a comparative analysis and in no way are intended to replace or supersede any of the information required by the Settlement Agreement.

This section again presents calculations of turnover within the BMCW using three of the four additional measures identified within the *Workforce Recruitment and Retention in the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare: Results From Staff Surveys and Focus Groups* (October 2005) report (Authored by Helen Bader School of Social Welfare - UWM, Child Welfare League of America, Chapin Hall Center for Children – University of Chicago).

The three measures used for the comparative analysis to determine a turnover rate are described in “Appendix D – Human Resource Functions: Calculation of Worker Turnover” of the above mentioned report. The method to determine the calculation and collection of data specific to the fourth measure is still being validated at this time.

Recommended Turnover Calculations - As a result of the above considerations, we recommend a multi-pronged approach to analyzing turnover within the BMCW. This approach involves four separate analyses:

- total turnover by position, turnover resulting from internal transfers and promotions;
- turnover deemed non-preventable (using the APHSA definition); and
- a measure of the direct effect of turnover on clients (i.e., the number of case managers a client experiences during a given year).

A calculation of total turnover by position for any reason

Number of Annual Separations from the Specified Position

Average Number of Filled Positions at the Beginning of Each Month

The table below reflects the calculation by region for the first six months of CY 2006. To date in CY 2006, there has been solid progress in staff retention. Comparing CY 2005 to the first six months of CY 2006, the first turnover calculation shows a 37.3% decrease in percentages between the two periods.

Staff stability by region YTD 2006

	Separations January to June 2006	Average Filled Positions January to June 2006	Turnover Percentage January to June 2006
Region 1	12	68	17.6%
Region 2	10	79	12.7%
Region 3	8	61	13.1%
BMCW 2006 (YTD)	30	208	14.4%
BMCW 2005	113	210	53.8%

A calculation of turnover due to promotions and transfers:

The data for the following calculation was provided from each agency's description of the reasons turnover occurred at the specific Sites.

Number of annual separations from the specified position due to promotions and transfers

Number of annual separations

Turnover due to Promotions and Transfers	
CY 2006 (Jan – June)	6 Month
Region 1 (N=0)	NA
Region 2 (N=1)	10.0%
Region 3 (N=0)	NA
BMCW (N=1)	3.3%

- Through the first six months of CY 2006, only one ongoing case manager had an internal transfer. There were no ongoing case managers who were promoted. This is minimal internal movement when compared to CY 2005.
- During CY 2006 YTD one ongoing case manager accepted an internal transfer from Region 2. This accounted for 10% of the turnover at that Region, and for 3.3% overall. Comparatively, during CY 2005, 14.2% of the turnover was attributed to promotions or transfers – or, 16 OCMs were provided with advancement (or other) opportunities within their agencies.

A Calculation of Turnover Deemed Non-Preventable

The data used in the following calculation was provided from each agency's description of the reasons turnover occurred at the specific regions.

The BMCW changed several of the previous categories identified at the time an employee exited so that turnover data will be collected in a manner directly matching the coding used within the updated categories identified in the report *Workforce Recruitment and Retention in the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare: Results From Staff Surveys and Focus Groups* to obtain an accurate measurement.

Number of annual separations from the specified position for non-preventable reasons

Number of annual separations

Non-Preventable Turnover	
CY 2006	Six Month
Region 1 (N=3)	25%
Region 2 (N=6)	60%
Region 3 (N=0)	NA
BMCW (N=9)	30%

- During the first six months of CY 2006, 30% of the ongoing case manager turnover the BMCW experienced (using the APHSA definition) was considered “non-preventable” or turnover that occurred for reasons that do not directly relate to the current job or agency.